arXiv:1610.07926v1 [math.DG] 25 Oct 2016

MINIMAL rPD-TWIN SURFACES

HAO CHEN

Abstract. We study a 2-parameter family of minimal surfaces with twin structure, namely the rPD-twin surfaces. A (polysynthetic) rPD-twin surface can be seen as copies of an rPD-surface that are symmetric about parallel mirrors. Candidates of rPD-twin surfaces appear in the work of Fujimori and Weber (2009). Periodic problem for these surfaces are only solved for extreme cases. We provide numerical evidences, mainly with Brakke's Surface Evolver, which show that rPD-twin surfaces exist for a large set, but not all parameters. In particular, our calculation justifies the minimal D-twin surface recently observed in experiment by Han et al. (2014), and predicts that it can only occur on a small scale.

1. Introduction

In material science, a *crystal twinning* refers to a symmetric coexistence of two or more crystals related by Euclidean motions. The most simple situation, namely the *reflection twin*, consists of two crystals related by a reflection in the boundary plane.

Triply periodic minimal surfaces (TPMS) are minimal surfaces with the symmetries of crystals. They are used to model lyotropic liquid crystals and many other structures in nature. Recently, Han et al. [HXBC11] synthesized mesoporous crystal spheres with polyhedral hollows. A crystallographic study shows a structure of Schwarz' D-surface. Most interestingly, twin structures are observed at the boundaries of the domains; see Figure 1. In the language of crystallography, the twin boundaries are {111}-planes. We also notice Figure 7.1(b) in [HBL$^+$96], which seems like another evidence, but did not catch the attention.

However, it is mathematically premature to call the observed structure "minimal twin surface". Despite the common belief and various convincing explanations, the energetic base of lyotropic liquid crystals forming periodic minimal surfaces is not well understood; see for instance [SKM$^+$07] and references therein. Hence we could not say for sure that the observed surface is minimal. Moreover, it is *a priori* not known that a minimal surface with the observed structure exists. And even worse, there is not yet a well-defined notion of "minimal twin surface" in mathematics. The goal of this note is to come up with a reasonable definition for "minimal twin surfaces", and investigate their existence.

Because of the analyticity of minimal surfaces, the definition of twinning in physics does not apply to TPMS. We propose to define a reflection twin of a TPMS as a doubly periodic minimal surface that is symmetric about a plane. The lack of periodicity in one direction is however very inconvenient. Hence we will mainly work on polysynthetic twins, which is a TPMS with parallel reflection planes. In both cases, we expect the surfaces to be "close" to the original surface, but we did not manage to formalize this idea in general settings.

In view of the experimentally observed twinning of the D-surface, we naturally expand our interest to rPD-surfaces, a family of TPMS parametrized by a real number $t > 0$ generalizing Schwarz' D- and P-surfaces. The common symmetries of the rPD-surfaces allow an uniform approach. More specifically, the polysynthetic rPD-twins is a family of triply periodic minimal surfaces $\Phi_{t,n}$, parametrized by a real number $t > 0$ and an integer $n > 0$, with the following properties

- $\Phi_{t,n}$ has vertical symmetry planes (parallel to the z-axis) reflections in which form a $(3, 3, 3)$-triangle group;

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53A10, 49Q05.

Key words and phrases. Triply periodic minimal surfaces, Twin lattice, Surface Evolver.



FIGURE 1. Twin structure in minimal D-surface observed in experiment. Reuse with permission from Han et al., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2011, 133 (16), pp 6106–6109. Copyright ©2011 American Chemical Society.

- $\Phi_{t,n}$ has horizontal symmetry planes (orthogonal to the z-axis) reflections in which form an infinite dihedral group.
- $\Phi_{t,n}$ modulo the reflectional symmetries is "close" to a "segment" of the rPD-surface with parameter t.

See Definition 3 for clarifications of the non-mathematical words.

We will provide numerical evidences showing that $\Phi_{t,n}$ exists for a large set of parameters, but very unlikely to exist if t and n are too large. In particular, we conjecture that the reflection rPD-twin surface, seen as the limit of polysynthetic twins with large n, does not exist.

We notice candidates for $\Phi_{t,n}$ in previous studies. In particular, Fujimori and Weber [FW09] constructed minimal surfaces with the expected symmetries for $\Phi_{t,n}$. They solved the period problem for $n \leq 3$, while Traizet [Tra08] solved the period problem for any n with sufficiently small t. However, our numerical calculation shows that the period problem has *no* solution for sufficiently large t, even when $n = 3$.

Brakke's Surface Evolver [Bra92] is an efficient gradient descender for minimizing various energies on surfaces. We obtain a minimal surface if we manage to reduce the integral of squared mean curvature down to practically 0. In this way, we are able to construct $\Phi_{\sqrt{1/2},n}$ (D-twin) numerically for n as large as 199. In particular, it is now reasonable to believe that the D-twin observed in experiment is indeed a minimal twin surface. For larger t and n, our calculation is inconclusive. This leads to the conjecture that $\Phi_{t,n}$ do not exist for sufficiently large n.

This note is organized as follows. Definition for the notion of twinning is discussed in Section 2. Then we introduce the rPD family in Section 3, and speculate properties of their twins assuming their existence. In Section 4, we review the work of Fujimori and Weber [FW09] and Traizet [Tra08],

and provide numerical evidence for the non-existence of $\Phi_{t,3}$ with large t. Finally in Section 5, we construct $\Phi_{t,n}$ for reasonably large parameters using Surface Evolver.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank my wife, Chenyu Jin, for introducing me to the experiment that motivates this research. I'm very grateful to Karsten Gross-Brauckmann for valuable suggestions, to Matthias Weber for suggestions and Mathematica programs, and to Lu Han for helpful discussions.

2. Definition of twinning

Before we proceed, we need to clarify what we mean by the word "twin". In this section, we try to propose definitions of TPMS twinning in a general setting, by summarising the properties we expect for minimal twin surfaces. Note that we do not know the existence of the defined object.

In physics, a crystal is modeled by a *Bravais lattice*, which can be defined as a discrete point set $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ invariant under three linearly independent translations. A *lattice plane* of Λ is a plane H such that $H \cap \Lambda$ is invariant under two linearly independent translations (hence a 2-dimensional lattice). We say that H is *trivial* if Λ is symmetric about H. The *reflection twin* of Λ about a non-trivial lattice plane H consists of lattice points of Λ on one side of H, and their reflective images on the other side. We call H the *twin boundary*. Bravais lattice is however an idealized model. In reality, twinning a lattice will introduce inhomogeneity to energy, hence atoms near the twin boundary will be slightly pulled away from their original lattice position.

In mathematics, a lattice Λ may be seen as a discrete group acting on $\mathbb{R}^3$ by translations. A *triply periodic minimal surface* (TPMS) $\mathsf{P} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a minimal surface invariant under the action of a lattice. The fundamental domain of orientation preserving translational symmetries of P is called the *translational unit*[1]. A plane H is a *lattice plane* of P if $H \cap \mathsf{P}$ is invariant under the action of a 2-dimensional lattice, and H is *trivial* if P is invariant under the reflection in H. Planes parallel to a lattice plane are lattice planes with the same translational symmetries.

We could copy the definition of lattice twinning in physics: take the part of P on one side of H and reflect it to the other side. However, as long as H is non-trivial, the surface obtained is usually not smooth on the twin boundary, hence definitely not a minimal surface. Minimizing the area functional will inevitably cause a perturbation near the twin boundary. In this sense, TPMS seems like a more realistic model for crystals than Bravais lattices.

Like Bravais lattices, TPMS often admit extra symmetries apart from the translations. The *symmetry group* or *space group* of a TPMS P, denoted by $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathsf{P})$, is the group of orientation preserving Euclidean symmetries of P. The fundamental domain of $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathsf{P})$ is called the *fundamental unit*[2]. For a lattice plane H of P, $\mathrm{Sym}(H)$ denotes the group of symmetries of $H \cap \mathsf{P}$ induced by the symmetries in $\mathrm{Sym}(\mathsf{P})$. Parallel lattice planes have the same symmetry group.

As in the case of crystal twinning, we expect the reflection twin of P about H to be invariant under the action of $\mathrm{Sym}(H)$. Moreover, we expect the reflection twin of P to be "close" to P away from the twin boundary. Take these properties into account, we propose the following definition for the reflection twin of a TPMS:

Definition 1. Let $\mathsf{P} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a triply periodic minimal surface, and H be a non-trivial lattice plane of P. A *reflection twin* of P (or a P-*twin*) about H is a doubly periodic minimal surface Φ such that

- Φ is invariant under the action of $\mathrm{Sym}(H)$;
- Φ is invariant under the reflection in H;
- there is a sequence of Euclidean isometries $(T_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that the sequence $(T_k(\Phi))_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges smoothly to P in a half-space.

This definition embodies desired features for twin minimal surfaces. We also expect Φ to be "close" to P near the twin boundary H, but are not able to formalize the idea of "close" in general situation. As a consequence, Φ could be very different from P in the neighborhood of H, and the

[1]The crystallographic term is "primitive unit cell".

[2]The crystallographic term is "asymmetric unit".

reflection twin of P around H is probably not unique. When it comes to a specific surface, like rPD-surfaces, we will make further clarifications.

Furthermore, for lack of periodicity in one direction, the definition is not practical for our purpose. As a doubly periodic minimal surface, Φ has infinite genus in the quotient, and we lack the tools to deal with such situation. On the other hand, computers do not really understand infinity, hence the definition is not convenient for numerical calculations. Therefore, we decide to approximate a reflection twin of P by a family of TPMS. More specifically, we introduce parallel reflection planes, then increase their distance to infinity.

Definition 2. Let Φ be a reflection twin of a TPMS P about a lattice plane H. A sequence of triply periodic minimal surfaces $(\Phi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is *approximating* Φ if

- Φ_n is invariant under the action of $\mathrm{Sym}(H)$;
- Φ_n is invariant under the reflections in H and another plane H_n parallel to H;
- $(\Phi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges compactly and smoothly to Φ.

Here "converges compactly" means that the sequence $(\Phi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges uniformly to Φ on any compact set of $\mathbb{R}^3$. We call Φ_n's *polysynthetic twins* of P, a term borrowed from crystallography. Again, we expect Φ_n modulo the reflections to be "close" to P even for small n, but can not formalize the idea for general situation. For rPD-surfaces, we will propose a clearer definition.

It is worth repeating that we do not know the existence of the defined objects. In fact, we will argue that there is no reflection twin for rPD-surfaces. It is possible that some other TPMS admits a reflection twin. But it is equally possible that no TPMS admits a reflection twin.

3. The rPD-surfaces and their twins

The rPD-family is a 1-parameter family of TPMS generalizing Schwarz' D and P surfaces. The Weierstrass representation of the translational unit of an rPD-surface is given by [Fog93, FH99]

$$\mathsf{P}_t\colon \omega \mapsto \mathrm{Re}\int^{\omega} (1-z^2, i(1+z^2), 2z)R(z)\,dz,$$

where $\omega\in\mathbb{C}$ and

$$R(z) = z(z^3-t^3)(z^3+t^{-3})^{-1/2}, \tag{1}$$

and $t>0$ is the parameter. The Schwarz' D and P surfaces are restored with $t=\sqrt{1/2}$ and $t=\sqrt{2}$, respectively. The rPD-family is self-conjugate; the conjugate surface of P_t is $\mathsf{P}_{1/t}$.

The formula in (1) is first obtained by Meeks [Mee90]; see also [FH92, FH92b]. In fact, Meeks discovered a 5-dimensional family of TPMS. For a surface in Meeks' family, the Gauss map represents the translational unit as a two-sheeted cover of $\mathbb{S}^2$ with four antipodal pairs (eight in total) of simple branch points. The branch points correspond to the flat points on the surface. For instance, after a stereographic projection onto the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$, the branch points of P_t are the roots of $R(z)^{-2}$; see the circles in Figure 3.

The Weierstrass representation reflects the symmetries of rPD-surfaces. More specifically, the surface has vertical symmetry planes (parallel to the z-axis). They correspond to the straight lines in Figure 3. The group generated by these reflections is the Euclidean triangle group with parameters $(3,3,3)$. Weyhaupt [Wey06, Theorem 3.14] proved that an embedded TPMS of genus 3 with these symmetries must be a member of the rPD-family or the H-family.

We recommend the following way to visualize rPD-surfaces. Consider two equiangular triangles that intersect the z-axis perpendicularly at their centers, whose projections on the xy plane differ by a rotation of $\pi/3$. Our building block, which we call *catenoid unit*, is the "catenoid" spanned the two triangles. The whole surface is obtained by order-2 rotations about the edges of the triangles.

If the projections of the triangles coincide on the xy plane, then the same construction yields a H surface. Catenoid units of H-surfaces are expected on the twin boundary of rPD-twins.

The 1-parameter family is obtained by "stretching" the two triangles along the z-axis. Let $h(t)$ denote the height of the catenoid unit (distance along the z-axis) assuming unit inradius for the triangles, and $A(t)$ be the area of the catenoid assuming unit total area for two triangles. Using

the formulae given in Appendix A of [FH99] (where the parameter r_0 correspond to our $1/t$), we plot h and A in Figure 2. The calculations are done in Sage [The16].



FIGURE 2. Plot of the height h (blue) and the area A (red) of a catenoid unit against the parameter t of rPD-surfaces.

The height h attains its maximum $h_{\max} = 1.529295\cdots$ at $t_0 = 0.494722\cdots$ and converges to 0 in both limits $t \to \infty$ and $t \to 0$. If $h > h_{\max}$, the triangles span no catenoid, and the only minimal surface is two disjoint disks spanned by the triangles. Any $h < h_{\max}$ corresponds to two parameters, hence two different rPD-surfaces; the one with bigger t has smaller area.

The area A attains its maximum $S_{\max} = 1.163261\cdots$ at $t = 0.494893\cdots$ and converges to 1 in the limit $t \to 0$, to $1/3$ in the limit $t \to \infty$. The area exceeds 1 as long as $t < t_1 = 0.877598\cdots$. Hence for t between t_0 and t_1, the catenoid is only a local minimizer for the area functional; the two disks spanned by the triangles has smaller area.

Other interesting points are $t = \sqrt{1/2}$ for the D-surface, $t = \sqrt{2}$ for the P-surface, $t = 1$ is a self-conjugate surface, and $t = 1/t_0$ is the rGPD-surface in [FH99].

In the D-twin observed in experiment, the twin boundary H is a horizontal plane (orthogonal to the z-axis) and slices catenoid units in the middle. We are interested in a reflection twin Φ_t or polysynthetic twins $(\Phi_{t,n})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of the rPD-surface P_t about horizontal planes. In the following, we assume the existence of these minimal twin surfaces, and speculate their properties.

Let us consider the *reflectional unit*, the fundamental domain of the reflection symmetries. It is an infinite triangular prism for P_t, and would be a semi-infinite triangular prism for Φ_t, or triangular prisms with finite length for $\Phi_{t,n}$. Modulo the reflection symmetries, each of these surfaces, if exist, can be seen as a minimal patch with free boundary condition on the boundary of the triangular prism. The whole surface is obtained from the patch by reflections in the faces of the prism.

Thanks to the reflection symmetries, we can now clarify the notion of "close" for polysynthetic rPD-twin surfaces.

Definition 3. A *polysynthetic* rPD-*twin surface*, denoted by $\Phi_{t,n}$ with parameter $t > 0$ and $n > 0$, is a triply periodic minimal surface such that

- $\Phi_{t,n}$ has vertical symmetry planes, reflections in which form a $(3, 3, 3)$-triangle group; and horizontal symmetry planes, reflections in which form a infinite dihedral group. The reflectional unit of $\Phi_{t,n}$ is a triangular prism of height $nh(t)$;
- Modulo the reflection symmetries, the boundary of the $\Phi_{t,n}$-patch intersects the lateral edges of the triangular prism n times, and visits the lateral faces of the triangular prism in the same order as the P_t-patch between two horizontal planes at distance $nh(t)$.

We restrain from defining the reflection rPD-twin, because we do not know the existence of polysynthetic rPD-twin with large n. If $\Phi_{t,n}$ exists as $n \to \infty$, we then expect $\Phi_{t,n}$ to converge compactly and smoothly to a reflection twin Φ_t; see Definition 2.

So the translational unit of $\Phi_{t,n}$ would be a minimal surface of genus $2n+1$ in the 3-torus. Under the Gauss map, together with a stereographic projection, the reflection symmetries in the horizontal twin boundaries correspond to the inversion symmetry in the unit circle in $\mathbb{C}$. Φ_t is doubly periodic, so the translational unit is of infinite genus, hence the Gauss map on its translational unit is a countably-sheeted cover of $\mathbb{S}^2$. $\Phi_{t,n}$ has genus $2n+1$, so the Gauss map is a $2n$-sheeted cover of $\mathbb{S}^2$ with $8n$ branch points [Mee90]. In both cases, we can think of each sheet as coming from a catenoid unit. We expect Φ_t and $\Phi_{t,n}$ to be a perturbation of P_t in their reflectional units. Assuming their existence, we speculate the following branching structure for the Gauss map:

- Adjacent sheets are joined at a simple branch point at 0 or ∞ alternatively. Hence for $\Phi_{t,n}$, there are n branch points at 0, and n at ∞.
- For $\Phi_{t,n}$, there are $2n$ non-zero finite branch points on the real axis, one for each pair of adjacent sheets. They are symmetric under the inversion in the unit circle.
- Seen as a compactly supported real valued function on $\mathbb{Z}$, the branch points of $\Phi_{t,n}$ on the real axis converge compactly, as $n \to \infty$, to the countably many non-zero finite branch points of Φ_t on the real axis.
- The non-zero finite branch points of Φ_t has four accumulation points at $\pm t$ and $\pm 1/t$.
- The other $4n$ branch points of the Gauss map are obtained by the order-3 rotations about the origin.



FIGURE 3. Branch points for rPD-surfaces (circles) and speculated branch points for an rPD-twin (solid dots, $n = 10$). The shadowed area corresponds to the reflectional unit.

A typical situation is schematized in Figure 3, where solid dots represents the speculated branch points for the Gauss map of a rPD-twin. For the $\Phi_{t,n}$ to be embedded, the position of the branch points are not arbitrary. They need to solve the period problem; see the next section.

4. Candidates for polysynthetic rPD-twins

Fujimori and Weber [FW09] developed an approach to construct surfaces with vertical symmetry planes. Instead of a cover of $\mathbb{S}$, the Gauss map descends to the quotient torus $\mathbb{C}/\langle 1, \tau\rangle$, where $\tau \in i\mathbb{R}_+$ is an adjustable parameter. For example, the Weierstrass representation of an rPD-surface is given by [Wey06, Wey08]

$$\mathsf{P}_\tau \colon \omega \mapsto \operatorname{Re} \int^\omega (\frac{1}{2}(G^{-1} - G), \frac{i}{2}(G^{-1} + G), 1)\, dz,$$

where the Gauss map

$$G = \Big(\rho \frac{\vartheta(z;\tau)}{\vartheta(z - 1/2 - \tau/2;\tau)}\Big)^{2/3}$$

is defined on the torus $\mathbb{C}/\langle 1, \tau\rangle$. Here, ρ is the Lopez-Ros factor, and

$$\vartheta(z;\tau) = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\pi(k+\frac{1}{2})^2\tau + 2\pi i(k+\frac{1}{2})(z-\frac{1}{2})}$$

is one of the Jacobi ϑ-functions. Note that the zeros and poles of G correspond to points on P_τ with vertical normal vectors. These points lie on the intersections of the vertical symmetry planes. Note that $\operatorname{Im}\tau$ is different from t in the previous section; but the two parameters are equivalent. The Schwarz' P-surface is restored with $\operatorname{Im}\tau = 1.563401\cdots$. We plot the height of the catenoid unit against $\operatorname{Im}\tau$ in Figure 4, to compare with Figure 2. The plot is generated by Sage [The16], but the calculations are done using mpmath [J+13]. The relation between conjugate surfaces is similar: the conjugate surface of P_τ is $\mathsf{P}_{-1/\tau}$.



FIGURE 4. Plot of the height h of the catenoid unit assuming unit inradius for the boundary triangles against $\operatorname{Im}\tau$.

Apart from the vertical reflection planes, a horizontal reflection plane is often assumed in [FW09] in order to take advantage of the symmetry. This would be the case for the reflection twin Φ_τ and the polysynthetic twins $\Phi_{\tau,n}$. Up to a translation, we may assume that the horizontal reflection symmetry correspond to the reflection symmetry in the imaginary axis in $\mathbb{C}$.

Following the argument in [FW09], we speculate that the Gauss map for $\Phi_{\tau,n}$ is

$$G = \rho \prod_{k \text{ odd}} \Big(\frac{\vartheta((z-p_k)/n;\tau/n)}{\vartheta((z+p_k)/n;\tau/n)}\Big)^{2/3} \prod_{k \text{ even}} \Big(\frac{\vartheta((z-p_k-\tau/2)/n;\tau/n)}{\vartheta((z+p_k-\tau/2)/n;\tau/n)}\Big)^{-2/3}$$

where $(p_k)_{1\le k\le n}$ are real numbers such that $0 < p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_n < n/2$ and $p_k + p_{n+1-k} = n/2$. Note that we scale the ϑ-function by $1/n$ so that the Gauss map of $\Phi_{\tau,n}$, up to a translation, looks "similar" to that of P_τ. If $\Phi_{\tau,n}$ exists as $n \to \infty$, we would expect the sequence $(p_k)_{1\le k\le n}$, seen as compactly supported real valued functions on $\mathbb{Z}$, to converge compactly to an infinite sequence $(q_k)_{k>0}$ as $n \to \infty$, and the sequence $(\Delta q_k = q_{k+1} - q_k)_{k>0}$ has $1/2$ as its unique accumulation point.

The difficulty is to solve the period problem. In our case, the period problem for $\Phi_{\tau,n}$ asks to find p_k such that

$$\operatorname{Re}\int^{p_k} (\frac{1}{2}(G^{-1} - G), \frac{i}{2}(G^{-1} + G))\, dz,$$

are vertices of an equiangular triangle. In [FW09], the period problem is solved for small n's, as an answer is immediate by symmetry. When $n = 1$ we have $p_1 = 1/4$; this is a H-surface. When $n = 2$, we have $p_1 = 1/4$ and $p_2 = 3/4$; this is Karcher's T-WP surface.

For $n = 3$, the period problem is 1-dimensional. Examples of $\Phi_{t,3}$ are computed numerically. The Mathematica program for this purpose is kindly provided to us by Matthias Weber. The



FIGURE 5. Poles and zeros of G for rPD-surface (circle) and speculated poles and zeros of G for rPD-twins (solid dots). The dotted rectangle indicates the torus $\mathbb{C}/\langle 1, \tau\rangle$, and the dashed vertical line indicates the horizontal reflection symmetry.

period problem asks to solve the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re}\int_0^{1/2+\tau/2} \frac{i}{2}(G^{-1}+G)\,dz &= 0 \\ \sqrt{3}\operatorname{Re}\int_{\tau/2}^{1/2} \frac{1}{2}(G^{-1}-G)\,dz + \operatorname{Re}\int_{\tau/2}^{1/2} \frac{i}{2}(G^{-1}+G)\,dz &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

By symmetry, we could fix $p_2 = 3/4$. This identifies the lhs of the equations. When we change τ to a very large value, Mathematica can not find any root. This raises doubt on the existence of solution, which is confirmed by plotting the lhs of (2) agains $p_1/3$; see Figure 6 for four plots with increasing value of $\operatorname{Im}\tau$. In the plot we allow $p_1 > p_2 = 3/4$, in which case p_1 should be understood as p_3; the symmetry is obvious. It is clearly that the period problem has no solution for $\operatorname{Im}\tau \geq 3$. The figure also shows what is happening as $\operatorname{Im}\tau$ increases: p_1 and p_3 are pushed towards the center $p_2 = 3/4$, finally meet there and vanish. We calculate that $p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = 3/4$ when $\operatorname{Im}\tau = 2.916517\cdots$.

Observation 1. *There is a real number $T > 0$ such that the period problem for $\Phi_{t,3}$ has no solution for $t > T$.*

This observation is no surprise. The smaller the parameter t is, the closer the catenoid unit is to a standard catenoid. A standard catenoid has a natural horizontal symmetry plane, hence it is easier to twin P_t for small t. In the other limit $t \to \infty$, helicoids are forming. As the only properly embedded simply connected non-planar minimal surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ [MR05], it is not possible to twin the standard helicoid. Hence twinning P_t with large t is expected to be difficult or impossible. On the one hand, when t is large, P_t is far from perpendicular to the horizontal planes. Hence to meet the free boundary condition, a larger perturbation would be needed for larger t. It is the perturbation that pushes p_1 and p_3 towards p_2. On the other hand, there is little space for perturbation if t is large. These two factors eliminates the possibility of $\Phi_{t,n}$ with large t.

Numerical solution for larger n is challenging. But it is now reasonable to conjecture that

Conjecture 1. . *There is a monotonically decreasing function $T(n) > 0$, $n \geq 3$, such that the period problem for $\Phi_{t,n}$ has no solution for $t > T(n)$.*

In the other end, for any n, the period problem is solved by Traizet [Tra08] for sufficiently small τ. We now introduce his work.



FIGURE 6. Plot of the lhs of (2) against $p_1/3$. Top-left is the twin of D-surface. Top-right is the twin of P-surface.

Take rPD-family as an example. Note that for small τ, the rPD-surface P_τ appears as horizontal planes connected by catenoid necks. As $\tau \to 0$, P_τ converges to a countably sheeted plane with singular points, which is a minimal immersion P_0 of a singular manifold. We label the planes by $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and identify the plane to $\mathbb{C}$ so that we can talk about positions by complex numbers. Then the catenoid neck between the k-th and $(k+1)$-th plane converges to singular points at $k(1+a)/3$ and its orbit under the translations $\langle 1, a\rangle$, where $a = \exp(i\pi/3)$.

In fact, modulo the translational symmetries $\langle 1, a\rangle$, there is a unique neck between each pair of adjacent planes. The neck converges to a singular point at three possible positions, namely $j(1+a)/3$ with $j = 0, 1, 2$. Let j_k be the limit position of the neck between the k-th and the $(k+1)$-th plane, we obtain an infinite sequence $(j_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ consisting of letters 0, 1 and 2. For rPD-surfaces P_τ, the sequence $\cdots 012012012 \cdots$ is periodic. Hence for an rPD-twin Φ_τ, we expect the sequence to be palindromic yet "periodic" on each end, like $\cdots 01201210210 \cdots$. For polysynthetic rPD-twin $\Phi_{\tau,n}$, we expect an $2n$-periodic and palindromic sequence, like $\cdots 010101 \cdots$ for the H-surface, or $\cdots 012101210 \cdots$ for the T-WP surface. At this point, crystallographers should notice the analogy of rPD- and H-family with the cubic and hexagonal close packings.

Traizet [Tra08] proved that, if the sequence is periodic and the limit position of the catenoid necks satisfy a certain force balancing condition, then there is a smooth family of embedded TPMS in the neighborhood of the limit minimal immersion at $\tau = 0$. The force balancing condition is formulated in terms of interactions between the necks. More specifically, it requires a certain "force" to vanish at each neck. We adopt the formula of "force" in [Tra08, Section 4.3.1]. The formula only involves necks in adjacent layers. If the limit positions of necks in three consecutive layers is 012, the balance condition is verified in [Tra08, Section 4.3.3]; see also Proposition 3 of the same paper. In the neighborhood of the twin boundary, the limit positions of the necks are 010. We verify by Mathematica [Wol16] that

$$-2\zeta\Big(\frac{1+a}{3}\Big) + \frac{4}{3}\zeta(1/2) + \frac{4}{3}\zeta(a/2) = 0$$

where

$$\zeta(z) = \frac{1}{z} + \sum_{0\neq w\in\langle 1,a\rangle} \Big(\frac{1}{z-w} + \frac{1}{w} + \frac{z}{w^2}\Big)$$

is the Weierstrass ζ function. Hence the force balancing condition is satisfied. This is no surprise in view of the H-family.

Therefore, for any $n > 0$, there is a real number $\epsilon_n > 0$ such that the polysynthetic twin $\Phi_{\tau,n}$ exists for $0 < \operatorname{Im}\tau < \epsilon_n$. In fact, the argument works for any periodic sequence. For example, the sequence $\dots 0101201012 \dots$ also satisfy the force balancing condition.

Traizet's proof uses implicit function theorem. We do not know if there is a universal $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\Phi_{\tau,n}$ are embedded for any $n > 0$ and $0 < \operatorname{Im}\tau < \epsilon$. Based on the observations in the next section, we will conjecture that this is not true.

5. Numerical calculation in Surface Evolver

Brakke's Surface Evolver [Bra92] is a software that simulates the physics of surfaces by minimizing energies. Surfaces are modeled by triangulations, and the energy is minimized by gradient descent method. Surface Evolver can handle various energies under various constraints. The program provides an operational definition for the word "close".

Usually, the energy to minimize is the surface tension energy or the area functional. However, contrary to the intuition of many, TPMS do not result from area minimization. In the translational unit, a TPMS is actually a strict maximum of the area functional among its parallel surfaces [GB12]. A TPMS is indeed stable for the area functional if a volume constraint is imposed in the translational unit [GBW96]. But this is again false for any slightly larger piece [Ros92]. The reflectional unit of $\Phi_{t,n}$ correspond to a large piece of P_t, hence the area functional is not our option.

We will minimize instead the Willmore energy, or more precisely, the integral of the squared mean curvature; see [HKS92] for Surface Evolver experiments on this energy. Physically, the Willmore energy measures the deviation of the surface from the zero mean curvature, hence models the "bending" energy. The Willmore energy is 0 for minimal surfaces. However, it could have non-zero local minimums. Hence our calculation is based on luck: we obtain a minimal surface only if the initial surface is sufficiently close to a minimal surface.

We generate the polysynthetic twins $\Phi_{t,n}$ in Surface Evolver in four steps:

(1) Prepare a catenoid unit.

Let $h = h(t)$ be the height function defined in Section 3. Consider four points

$$A(1,0,0), B(-1/2,\sqrt{3}/2,0), C(-1,0,h), D(1/2,\sqrt{3}/2,h).$$

The catenoid unit of P_t modulo reflectional symmetries is a minimal surface with fixed boundary conditions on the segments AB and CD, and free boundary conditions on the vertical planes $y \pm \sqrt{3}x = \sqrt{3}/2$. Reflections in these planes yield the whole catenoid unit. The boundary triangles has unit inradius, compatible with the discussions in Section 3. The unit is obtained in Surface Evolver by minimizing the area functional. As a consequence of this practice, we can only obtain rPD-surfaces with parameter $t > t_0 = 0.494722\cdots$.

(2) Generate a segment.

We generate a segment of P_t from the catenoid unit by order-2 rotations about the segment AB or CD. In Surface Evolver, this is done by listing the matrices, say `a` and `b`, of the two rotations in `VIEW_TRANSFORM_GENERATORS`. If $n = 2k-1$, we set `transform_expr` to be a string `ababa...` of length k. Then the Surface Evolver will display all the transformations of the catenoid unit whose matrices are substrings of `transform_expr` view as a matrix product. Finally, we use the `detorus` command to convert the displayed $n+1$ catenoid unit into a real surface.

(3) Slice the segment.

In this step, we use Brakke's script `slicer.cmd`. It is included in the Evolver distribution, and also available on the website of Surface Evolver. It removes the part of the surface on one side of a given plane. We slice the segment in the previous step by two horizontal planes in the middle of the lowest and the highest catenoid unit. The script also marks the vertices and edges newly created by the slice. This allows us to impose free boundary conditions by constraining the new vertices and edges on the slicing plane.

(4) Evolve the surface.

We turn off the surface tension energy (`set facet tension 0`), and turn on the Willmore energy, which is the integral of squared mean curvature. Then we leave Evolver to

minimize the energy. Apart from the command `g` that does one step of gradient descent, the command `hessian_seek` is particularly useful in this step to accelerate the calculation. If the Willmore energy decreases to practically 0, we obtain a minimal surface with free boundary condition on the boundary of a triangular prism. This is the reflectional unit of $\Phi_{t,n}$. Reflections in the faces of the prism give the whole $\Phi_{t,n}$. Nevertheless, it is possible that we reach a non-zero local minimum of the Willmore energy, and can not reduce the energy to 0. In this case, the calculation is inconclusive.

In Figure 7, we show the result of each step with $t = \sqrt{2}$ (Schwarz' P-surface) and $n = 3$.



FIGURE 7. Result of each step with $t = \sqrt{2}$ and $n = 3$.

The program can be easily modified to change the parameters t and n. We perform calculations for parameters $t = t_0, \sqrt{1/2}$ (D-surface), $1, \sqrt{2}$ (P-surface), and $n = 1$ (H-surface) $3, 5, 11, 21, 99$. When n is big, the last step will be very slow. We can increase the speed in the price of precision by reducing the faces in the catenoid unit. In Surface Evolver, the command `r` refines the surface by subdividing each triangle into four. When generating the catenoid unit, we refine five times for $n = 1, 3, 5$, four times for $n = 11, 21$ and three times for $n \geq 99$.

If we obtain a minimal surface, the calculation roughly solves the period problem. More specifically, the vertices transformed from A or C when we generate the segment are the poles and zeros of the Gauss map G. After normalization, the heights of these points give the sequence $(p_k)_{1\leq k\leq n}$. For example, the $\Phi_{\sqrt{1/2},3}$ (D-twin) generated by Surface Evolver has twin boundaries at $z = \pm 3\sqrt{2}/2$, and the surface intersects the lateral edges of the prism at $z \approx 0$ and $z \approx \pm 1.41240$. By a scaling and a translation, we may place the boundaries at $z = 0$ and $z = 3/2$, and obtain $p_1 \approx 0.25064$, $p_2 \approx 0.75$ and $p_3 \approx 1.24936$. Compared to the solution given by the Mathematica program used for [FW09], these values are accurate until the fifth digit after the decimal point. More importantly, our program can handle much larger n. However, the precision is not guaranteed as t increases. The $\Phi_{\sqrt{2},3}$ (P-twin) shown in Figure 7 gives $p_1 \approx 0.303350$, $p_2 \approx 0.75$ and $p_3 \approx 1.196651$, while Mathematica computes more precisely $p_1 = 0.293406\cdots$, $p_2 = 0.75$ and $p_3 = 1.20659\cdots$.

The calculation goes surprisingly smooth for small t and small n. For $t = t_0$ and $t = \sqrt{1/2}$ (D-surface), the Willmore energy decreases quickly to the order of 10^{-26} or lower, even when $n = 99$. In view of the discussion in Section 4, it is reasonable to believe that the calculation would be even faster for smaller t. The results for $t = \sqrt{1/2}$ and $n = 3, 5, 11, 21$ are shown in Figure 8. These pictures justify that the structure observed in [HXBC11] is indeed a minimal D-twin.

Observation 2. *The polysynthetic* rPD*-twins* $\Phi_{t,n}$ *exist for a large set of parameters.*

The Willmore energy also decreases to the order of 10^{-26} for $t = 1$ with $n \leq 21$, and for $t = \sqrt{2}$ with $n \leq 3$. However, for $t = 1$ and $n = 99$, the Surface Evolver only manages to reduce the Willmore energy to the order of 10^{-8}; then the decrement becomes extremely slow. For $t = \sqrt{2}$



FIGURE 8. Polysynthetic twins for the D-surface ($t = \sqrt{1/2}$). From top to bottom, $n = 3, 5, 11, 21$. The twin boundary is clearly seen in the middle.

(P-surface) and $n = 5$, the energy seems to stabilize at the order 10^{-4}. In view of these inconclusive results, we append more calculations for $t = \sqrt{1/2}$. It turns out that we are able to obtain a minimal surface with $n \leq 199$, but not with $n \geq 299$. Since the calculation is very time consuming, we did not bother to determine the exact n where the calculation becomes inconclusive.

Observation 3. *Surface Evolver does not converge to a minimal surface if t or n is too large.*

When the calculation is inconclusive, there are two possibilities. Either $\Phi_{t,n}$ exists, but Surface Evolver is trapped in a local minimum; or $\Phi_{t,n}$ does not exist, and Surface Evolver achieves the minimum of the Willmore energy.

The trend in t is already discussed in Conjecture 1. In addition, we could now guess that $T(5) < \sqrt{2}$. From the trend in n, we speculate a big perturbation near the twin boundary for large n, but we do not understand this phenomenon. This observation motivates the following conjecture:

Conjecture 2. *There is a monotonically decreasing function $N(t) > 0$, $t > 0$, such that the period problem for $\Phi_{t,n}$ has no solution for $n > N(t)$.*

Physically, this means that D-twin could only occur if the system scale is small. The D-twins reported in [HXBC11] is indeed observed on a small scales.

REFERENCES

[Bra92] K. A. Brakke, *The surface evolver*, Experiment. Math. **1** (1992), no. 2, 141–165. MR1203871

[FH92a] A. Fogden and S. T. Hyde, *Parametrization of triply periodic minimal surfaces. I. Mathematical basis of the construction algorithm for the regular class*, Acta Cryst. Sect. A **48** (1992), no. 4, 442–451. MR1170629

[FH92b] A. Fogden and S. T. Hyde, *Parametrization of triply periodic minimal surfaces. II. regular class solutions*, Acta Cryst. Sect. A **48** (1992), no. 4, 575–591. MR1170629

[FH99] A. Fogden and S. T Hyde, *Continuous transformations of cubic minimal surfaces*, The European Physical Journal B-Condensed Matter and Complex Systems **7** (1999), no. 1, 91–104.

[Fog93] A. Fogden, *Parametrization of triply periodic minimal surfaces. III. General algorithm and specific examples for the irregular class*, Acta Cryst. Sect. A **49** (1993), no. 3, 409–421. MR1228292

[FW09] S. Fujimori and M. Weber, *Triply periodic minimal surfaces bounded by vertical symmetry planes*, Manuscripta Math. **129** (2009), no. 1, 29–53. MR2496955

[GB12] K. Große-Brauckmann, *Triply periodic minimal and constant mean curvature surfaces*, Interface Focus **2** (2012), 582–588.

[GBW96] K. Große-Brauckmann and M. Wohlgemuth, *The gyroid is embedded and has constant mean curvature companions*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **4** (1996), no. 6, 499–523. MR1415998

[HBL+96] S. Hyde, Z. Blum, T. Landh, S. Lidin, B. W. Ninham, S. Andersson, and K. Larsson, *The language of shape*: *The role of curvature in condensed matter: Physics, chemistry and biology*, Elsevier, 1996.

[HKS92] L. Hsu, R. Kusner, and J. Sullivan, *Minimizing the squared mean curvature integral for surfaces in space forms*, Experiment. Math. **1** (1992), no. 3, 191–207. MR1203874

[HXBC11] L. Han, P. Xiong, J. Bai, and S. Che, *Spontaneous formation and characterization of silica mesoporous crystal spheres with reverse multiply twinned polyhedral hollows*, Journal of the American Chemical Society **133** (2011), no. 16, 6106–6109.

[J+13] F. Johansson et al., *mpmath: a Python library for arbitrary-precision floating-point arithmetic (version 0.18)*, 2013. `http://mpmath.org/`.

[Mee90] W. H. Meeks III, *The theory of triply periodic minimal surfaces*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **39** (1990), no. 3, 877–936. MR1078743

[MR05] W. H. Meeks III and H. Rosenberg, *The uniqueness of the helicoid*, Ann. of Math. (2) **161** (2005), no. 2, 727–758. MR2153399

[Ros92] M. Ross, *Schwarz' P and D surfaces are stable*, Differential Geom. Appl. **2** (1992), no. 2, 179–195. MR1245555

[SKM+07] G. C Shearman, B. J Khoo, M.-L. Motherwell, K. A Brakke, O. Ces, C. E Conn, J. M Seddon, and R. H Templer, *Calculations of and evidence for chain packing stress in inverse lyotropic bicontinuous cubic phases*, Langmuir **23** (2007), no. 13, 7276–7285.

[The16] The Sage Developers, *Sagemath, the Sage Mathematics Software System (Version 7.3)*, 2016. `http://www.sagemath.org`.

[Tra08] M. Traizet, *On the genus of triply periodic minimal surfaces*, J. Differential Geom. **79** (2008), no. 2, 243–275. MR2420019

[Wey06] A. G. Weyhaupt, *New families of embedded triply periodic minimal surfaces of genus three in euclidean space*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2006. Thesis (Ph.D.)–Indiana University. MR2709166

[Wey08] A. G. Weyhaupt, *Deformations of the gyroid and Lidinoid minimal surfaces*, Pacific J. Math. **235** (2008), no. 1, 137–171. MR2379774

[Wol16] Wolfram Research, Inc., *Mathematica, Version 11.0*, Champaign, Illinois, 2016.

School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of St Andrews
E-mail address: `hao.chen.math@gmail.com`